

01755
JUL 01 1998

Gary Reeve, Broker



Reeve-Associates Real Estate

FARM LAND

RANCHES

LAND INVESTMENTS

35 E. 10th St., Suite E-3

P.O. Box 215

Tracy, CA 95378 0215

(209) 835-2002

Fax (209) 835-2008

June 30, 1998

CalFed Bay-Delta Program
 Attention: Lester Snow, Executive Director
 Via Fax: (916) 654-9780

Regarding: Public Comment on the Draft Programatic Environmental
 Impact Report (EIS/EIR).

Dear Mr. Snow:

My family owns acreage in the south Delta near Tracy, which I farm. I am also an active ranch broker. I have reviewed the general information on the EIR and its three proposed alternatives and I have the following comments to make.

A.) The retirement of delta farmland appears to be what the report has identified as a solution to the need for more water sources. I am vehemently against this "solution" for these reasons: a.) The local economies in the delta region would be severely and negatively impacted from the loss of farmland production. b.) Retirement of land would essentially require a government taking of private property either by condemnation or by paying more for the land than it is worth. I believe that Eminent Domain, as envisioned by our nation's founders, was designed to only be used in extreme circumstances and for the good of the public. The taking of private property should be considered a very serious matter. The government has much better things to spend the taxpayers' money on than buying land from farmers and the placing these lands under the control of bureaucracies.

B.) The Isolated Facility or Peripheral Canal, as it should be properly identified, is, once again, a very bad idea. This plan would put Sacramento River water into the hands of the agency that controls this canal and would be taking this water from farming and environment uses in the delta. This costly plan would have a negative impact on local economies and the local ecology.

C.) No new storage facilities were identified. It is high time that the Auburn Dam be built as a storage and flood control facility on the American River.

D.) Desalinization was not identified as a possible cure to water shortages. Government funding should be increased for projects that attempt to lower the cost of desalinization for the benefit of coastal communities which could utilize ocean water.

E.) If low cost desalinization and demineralization could be accomplished it would also greatly benefit agriculture by taking the salts and harmful minerals, such as boron, out of groundwater, for use on farmland. Several irrigation districts along the westside of the San Joaquin Valley are currently prohibited from draining into the San Joaquin River drainage system because of high levels of minerals in the drain water. This, along with a shortage of fresh water for irrigation has led to a souring of some of the best soils in the world. This trend will continue until our nation loses this soil resource, or until a solution is found. Groundwater cleansing would wash off the harmful elements from the farmland with fresh water and restore the land. Drain water cleansing will benefit the downstream users and the downstream river environment and the westside farmland. I believe that a solution can be found and this would be government and taxpayer money well spent.

The Calfed report looks suspiciously like a plan to take water from one area for the benefit of another. I reject all three alternatives for these stated reasons. Please consider this letter. I will be happy to talk with Calfed and to work with Calfed in a way that will ensure an equitable solution. Call me at your convenience, if I can be of assistance.

Sincerely,



Gary Reeve,
Ranch Broker and Farmer